



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,682	02/12/2002	Jurgen Adams	1900P55320 US	9117

7590 11/20/2003
Martin A. Farber
Suite 473
866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

EXAMINER

DONG, DALEI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/074,682	ADAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dalei Dong	2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2003.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-30 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/074,682.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 11-18, 21-26 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,994,840 to Forsdyke in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,705,860 to Ninh.

Regarding to claims 11-18, 21-26 and 29-30, Forsdyke discloses in Figure 1, a “light source 1 is a fluorescent lamp it includes a suitable ballast” (column 1, line 51-52).

Forsdyke also discloses in Figure 1, “at least a part of the light transmissive envelope and preferably the whole of the light transmissive envelope of the source is provided with a coating 2 comprising electro chromic material. Suitable electrochromic materials include:

Iron (111) hexacyanoferrate

Pheanthro (9, 10-c) thiophene

Polyaniline and its substituted derivative and most transition metal oxides with intercalated small mobile ions such as Li, Na, or K” (column 1, line 53-61).

Forsdyke further discloses in Figure 1, “the material may be held in an inert host matrix. The light source 1 is connected to terminals 3 via a switch 4 in conventional

manner. A dimmer control circuit 5 powered from the mains provides a variable low voltage (e.g. 5-12 volts max) to the coating 2 on the light source 1 for varying the light transmission of the coating" (column 1, line 62-67).

Forsdyke further yet discloses in Figure 2, "the coating 2 comprises for example a layer 20 of the aforesaid electro chromic material sandwiched between layers 21 and 22 of light transmissive electrically conductive material" (column 2, line 8-11).

However, Forsdyke does not disclose a riveted cutting connection. Ninth teaches in Figures 3 and 4, "a preferred arrangement of connectors 28 for penetrating the display unit 10 chassis shown in bubble 100 in FIG. 3 are shown. Bracket 17 is provided to mechanically support the display unit 10 from, for example, the airframe structural members, while allowing display screen 11 to be movably positioned for optimum passenger entertainment. Connectors 28 pierce and make electrical contact with bracket 17 and terminate in circuitboard 18 to provide a low impedance path to ground for stray electrostatic charges which may develop and otherwise would be isolated or insufficiently removed in bracket 17, support 14 and the like. As has been mentioned, it is an important goal of this invention to provide a low impedance ground path for the system" (column 7, line 15-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilize the connector of Ninth for the connection of coating of Forsdyke in order to achieve a secure, reliable and low impedance connection between each layers of components and a easy manufacturing process.

3. Claims 19 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,994,840 to Forsdyke in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,705,860 to Ninh in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,188 to Zieba.

Regarding to claims 19 and 27, Forsdyke discloses a covering for a display device, the covering being translucent and at least partly covering a front side of the display device, further the covering shields electromagnetic fields and the covering is made of an intrinsically electrically conductive polymeric material.

However, Forsdyke does not disclose a riveted cutting connection and at least one colored layer. Ninh teaches a riveted cutting connection, however, fails to teach at least one colored layer.

Zieba teaches "The use of color filters to compensate for the inherent spectral properties and permit clear and readable color images is well known. In particular, depending on the inherent spectral properties, different PDPs may be enhanced with different colors, i.e., tinges, used as a filter. For example, one manufacturer may desire a device having a purple tinge for color correction while another may desire a blue- or green-tinged device for color correction of their PDP. Color correction can be advantageously incorporated into the device of the present invention. Thus, in a preferred embodiment, the IR absorbing coating constitutes a dye material which is selected to complement the color characteristics of particular PDPs, i.e., to be color correcting, and thus, to enhance the chromaticity of the display" (column 5, line 34-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilize the connector of Ninh for the connection of coating of

Forsdyke and further add the color filter of Zieba to the coating of Forsdyke in order to achieve a secure, reliable and low impedance connection between each layers of components and to compensate for the inherent spectral properties and permit clear and readable color images.

4. Claims 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,994,840 to Forsdyke in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,705,860 to Ninh in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,592 to Takahashi.

Regarding to claims 20 and 28, Forsdyke discloses a covering for a display device, the covering being translucent and at least partly covering a front side of the display device, further the covering shields electromagnetic fields and the covering is made of an intrinsically electrically conductive polymeric material.

However, Forsdyke does not disclose a riveted cutting connection and a high intrinsic conductivity polymer layer. Ninh teaches a riveted cutting connection, however, fails to teach a high intrinsic conductivity polymer layer.

Takahashi teaches in Figure 2, "a conductive layer 9 containing fine particles of Ag is formed first on the outer surface of the panel 1 made of, for example, glass. Then, an insulating covering layer 10 containing SiO₂ as a main component is formed to cover the entire surface of the conductive layer 10, followed by baking the laminate structure consisting of the conductive layer 10 and the covering layer 9. After the baking step, soldering is applied by using an ultrasonic soldering device "Sunbonder", trade name of an ultrasonic soldering machine manufactured by Asahi Glass K.K. Japan, to

bury the conductive member 8 such that the conductive member 8 is electrically connected at one end to the conductive layer 9 and exposed at the other end to the outside" (column 7, line 1-13).

Takahashi also teaches in Figure 3, "the conductive member 8 made of, for example, ITO is formed in advance on the surface of the panel 1, e.g., on the outer peripheral portion of the panel 1. Then, the conductive layer 9 is formed in an inner region on the surface of the panel 1 such that the outer peripheral portion of the conductive layer 9 is in contact with a part of the conductive member 8, followed by baking to permit the conductive member 8 to be electrically connected to the conductive layer 9. Further, an insulating covering layer 10 is formed to cover the entire surface of the conductive layer 9 with the conductive member 8 partly exposed to the outside" (column 7, line 14-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilize the connector of Ninh for the connection of coating of Forsdyke and further add the conductive member of Takahashi to the coating of Forsdyke in order to achieve a secure, reliable and low impedance connection between each layers of components and to obtain a high electrical conductivity and excellent in light transmittance and thus a clear image of a high contrast.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed October 1, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that Forsdyke reference fails to teach or show the use of covering electromagnetic fields and that the Forsdyke reference fails to teach the material that is utilize for the electromagnetic fields. Examiner asserts that the intended use of the material is not given patentable weight since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex Parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Also, in response to Applicant's argument that Forsdyke does not teach that the electrochromic material polyaniline is electrically conductive and therefore nothing that this material can be used for magnetic shielding. Examiner asserts that electrochromic material polyaniline is electrically conductive and that any material can be electrically conductive to a degree when enough voltage is applied to the material.

Further, in response to Applicant's argument that Ninh reference fails to teach a connector. Examiner asserts that Ninh teaches a connector and Applicant merely claims an electrical contact and the intended use of the electrical contact is not given a patentable weight since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex Parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). Thus, Examiner asserts that the prior art of record are valid and maintain the rejection.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalei Dong whose telephone number is (703)308-2870. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 A.M. to 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (703)305-4939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

D.D.
November 14, 2003


Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800